arXiv:1406.6567v2 [cs.DM] 11 Mar 2015

Fixed-Parameter Tractability of Token Jumping on Planar Graphs

Takehiro Ito[1], Marcin Kamiński[2], and Hirotaka Ono[3]

[1] Graduate School of Information Sciences, Tohoku University,
Aoba-yama 6-6-05, Sendai, 980-8579, Japan.
takehiro@ecei.tohoku.ac.jp
[2] Dept. of Mathematics, Computer Science and Mechanics, University of Warsaw,
Banacha 2, 02-097, Warsaw, Poland.
mjk@mimuw.edu.pl
[3] Faculty of Economics, Kyushu University,
Hakozaki 6-19-1, Higashi-ku, Fukuoka, 812-8581, Japan.
hirotaka@econ.kyushu-u.ac.jp

Abstract. Suppose that we are given two independent sets I_0 and I_r of a graph such that $|I_0| = |I_r|$, and imagine that a token is placed on each vertex in I_0. The TOKEN JUMPING problem is to determine whether there exists a sequence of independent sets of the same cardinality which transforms I_0 into I_r so that each independent set in the sequence results from the previous one by moving exactly one token to another vertex. This problem is known to be PSPACE-complete even for planar graphs of maximum degree three, and W[1]-hard for general graphs when parameterized by the number of tokens. In this paper, we present a fixed-parameter algorithm for TOKEN JUMPING on planar graphs, where the parameter is only the number of tokens. Furthermore, the algorithm can be modified so that it finds a shortest sequence for a yes-instance. The same scheme of the algorithms can be applied to a wider class of graphs which forbid a complete bipartite graph $K_{3,t}$ as a subgraph for a fixed integer $t \geq 3$.

1 Introduction

The TOKEN JUMPING problem was introduced by Kamiński et al. [13], which can be seen as a "dynamic" version of independent sets in a graph. An *independent set* of a graph G is a set of vertices of G in which no two vertices are adjacent. (See Fig. 1, which depicts six different independent sets of the same graph.) Suppose that we are given two independent sets I_0 and I_r of a graph $G = (V, E)$ such that $|I_0| = |I_r|$, and imagine that a token is placed on every vertex in I_0. Then, the TOKEN JUMPING problem is to determine whether there exists a sequence $\langle I_0, I_1, \ldots, I_\ell \rangle$ of independent sets of G such that

(a) $I_\ell = I_r$, and $|I_0| = |I_1| = \cdots = |I_\ell|$; and
(b) for each index $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \ell\}$, I_i can be obtained from I_{i-1} by moving exactly one token on a vertex $u \in I_{i-1}$ to another vertex $v \notin I_{i-1}$, and hence $I_{i-1} \setminus I_i = \{u\}$ and $I_i \setminus I_{i-1} = \{v\}$.



Fig. 1. A sequence $\langle I_0, I_1, \ldots, I_5 \rangle$ of independent sets of the same graph, where the vertices in independent sets are depicted by large black circles (tokens).

Such a sequence is called a *reconfiguration sequence* between I_0 and I_r. Figure 1 illustrates a reconfiguration sequence $\langle I_0, I_1, \ldots, I_5 \rangle$ of independent sets, which transforms I_0 into $I_r = I_5$; therefore, the answer is "YES" for this instance.

Recently, similar settings of problems have been extensively studied in the framework of reconfiguration problems [9], which arise when we wish to find a step-by-step transformation between two feasible solutions of a problem instance such that all intermediate solutions are also feasible and each step abides by a prescribed reconfiguration rule (i.e., an adjacency relation defined on feasible solutions of the original problem). For example, the TOKEN JUMPING problem can be seen as a reconfiguration problem for the (ordinary) independent set problem: feasible solutions are defined to be all independent sets of the same cardinality in a graph, as in the condition (a) above; and the reconfiguration rule is defined to be the condition (b) above. This reconfiguration framework has been applied to several well-studied combinatorial problems, including independent set [2,4,8,9,11,13,14,15,16], satisfiability [6], set cover, clique, matching [9], vertex-coloring [1,3], list edge-coloring [10], (list) $L(2,1)$-labeling [12], and so on.

1.1 Known and related results

The first reconfiguration problem for independent set, called TOKEN SLIDING, was introduced by Hearn and Demaine [8] which employs another reconfiguration rule. Indeed, there are three reconfiguration problems for independent set, called TOKEN JUMPING [4,11,13,16], TOKEN SLIDING [3,4,8,13,16], and TOKEN ADDITION AND REMOVAL [2,9,13,14,15,16]. (See [13] for the definitions.) These are the most intensively studied reconfiguration problems, and hence we here explain only the results strongly related to this paper; see the references above for the other results.

First, TOKEN JUMPING (indeed, all three reconfiguration problems for independent set) is PSPACE-complete for planar graphs of maximum degree three [3,8,11], for perfect graphs [13], and for bounded bandwidth graphs [16].

Second, Kamiński et al. [13] gave a linear-time algorithm for TOKEN JUMPING on even-hole-free graphs. Furthermore, their algorithm can find a reconfiguration sequence with the shortest length.

Third, Ito et al. [11] proved that TOKEN JUMPING is W[1]-hard for general graphs when parameterized only by the number of tokens. Therefore, it is very unlikely that the problem admits a fixed-parameter algorithm for general graphs when the parameter is only the number of tokens. They also gave a fixed-parameter algorithm for general graphs when parameterized by both the number of tokens and the maximum degree of graphs. Their algorithm can be modified so that it finds a reconfiguration sequence with the shortest length.

1.2 Our contribution

In this paper, we first give a fixed-parameter algorithm for TOKEN JUMPING on planar graphs when parameterized only by the number of tokens. Recall that TOKEN JUMPING is PSPACE-complete for planar graphs of maximum degree three, and is W[1]-hard for general graph when the parameter is only the number of tokens.

Interestingly, our algorithm for planar graphs utilizes only the property that no planar graph contains a complete bipartite graph $K_{3,3}$ as a subgraph [5]. We show that the same scheme of the algorithm for planar graphs can be applied to a wider class of graphs which forbid a complete bipartite graph $K_{3,t}$ as a subgraph for a fixed integer $t \geq 3$. (We call such graphs *$K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs*.)

In addition, the algorithm for $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs (and hence for planar graphs) can be modified so that it finds a reconfiguration sequence with the shortest length for a yes-instance. We note that the reconfiguration sequence in Fig. 1 is shortest. It is remarkable that the token on the vertex u in Fig. 1(a) must make a "detour" to avoid violating the independence of tokens: it is moved twice even though $u \in I_0 \cap I_r$. Our algorithm can capture such detours for $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs.

1.3 Strategy for fixed-parameter algorithms

We here explain two main ideas to develop a fixed-parameter algorithm for TOKEN JUMPING; formal descriptions will be given later.

The first idea is to find a sufficiently large "buffer space" to move the tokens. Namely, we first move all the tokens from I_0 to the buffer space, and then move them from the buffer space to I_r; thus, the answer is "YES" if we can find such a buffer space. Due to the usage, such a buffer space (a set of vertices) should be mutually independent and preferably not adjacent to any vertex in $I_0 \cup I_r$.

The second idea is to "shrink the graph" into a smaller one with preserving the reconfigurability (i.e., the existence/nonexistence of a reconfiguration sequence) between I_0 and I_r. This idea is based on the claim that, if the size of the graph is bounded by a function depending only on the parameter k, we can solve the problem in a brute-force manner in fixed-parameter running time.

Thus, it is useful to find such "removable" vertices in fixed-parameter running time, and shrink the graph so that the size of the resulting graph is bounded by a function of k.

The $K_{3,t}$-forbiddance (and hence $K_{3,3}$-forbiddance) of graphs satisfies the two main ideas above at the same time: it ensures that the graph has a sufficiently large independent sets, which may be used as a buffer space; and it characterizes removable vertices.

Due to the page limitation, we omit some proofs from this extended abstract.

2 Preliminaries

In this paper, we assume without loss of generality that graphs are simple. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with vertex set V and edge set E. The *order* of G is the number of vertices in G. We say that a vertex w in G is a *neighbor* of a vertex v if $\{v, w\} \in E$. For a vertex v in G, let $N_G(v) = \{w \in V \mid \{v, w\} \in E\}$. We also denote $N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ by $N_G[v]$. For a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, let $N_G(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G(v)$ and $N_G[S] = \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G[v]$.

For a vertex set $S \subseteq V$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$, $G[S]$ denotes the subgraph *induced* by S, that is, $G[S] = (S, E[S])$ where $E[S] = \{\{u, v\} \in E \mid \{u, v\} \subseteq S\}$. A vertex set S of G is an *independent set* of G if $G[S]$ contains no edge. A subgraph G' of G is called a *clique* if every pair of vertices in G' is joined by an edge; we denote by K_s a clique of order s. For two positive integers p and q, we denote by $K_{p,q}$ a complete bipartite graph with its bipartition of size p and q.

A graph is *planar* if it can be embedded in the plane without any edge-crossing [5]. In Section 3, our algorithms utilize an independent set of sufficiently large size in a graph, as a buffer space to move tokens. As for independent sets of planar graphs, the following is known, though the original description is about the four-color theorem.

Proposition 1 ([17]). *For a planar graph of order $n = 4s$, there exists an independent set of size at least s, and it can be found in $O(n^2)$ time.*

It is well known as Kuratowski's theorem that a graph is planar if and only if it does not contain a subdivision of K_5 or $K_{3,3}$ [5]. Therefore, any planar graph contains neither K_5 nor $K_{3,3}$ as a subgraph. In this paper, we extend our algorithm for planar graphs to a much larger class of graphs. For two positive integers p and q, a graph is *$K_{p,q}$-forbidden* if it contains no $K_{p,q}$ as a subgraph. For example, any planar graph is $K_{3,3}$-forbidden. It is important that any $K_{p,q}$-forbidden graph contains no clique K_{p+q} of size $p + q$.

In our algorithm for $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs in Section 3.2, we use Ramsey's theorem, instead of Proposition 1, to guarantee a sufficiently large independent set. Ramsey's theorem states that, for every pair of integers a and b, there exists an integer n such that any graph of order at least n has an independent set of size a or a clique of size b (see [7] for example). The smallest number n of vertices required to achieve this property is called a *Ramsey number*, denoted

by $\mathsf{Ramsey}(a, b)$. It is known that $\mathsf{Ramsey}(a, b) \leq \binom{a+b-2}{b-1}$ [7]. Since any $K_{p,q}$-forbidden graph contains no K_{p+q}, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *For integers p, q and s, let G be a $K_{p,q}$-forbidden graph of order at least $\mathsf{Ramsey}(s, p+q)$. Then, G has an independent set of size at least s.*

3 Fixed-Parameter Algorithm

In this section, we present a fixed-parameter algorithm for planar graphs to determine if a given TOKEN JUMPING instance is reconfigurable or not, as in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. TOKEN JUMPING *with k tokens can be solved for planar graphs $G = (V, E)$ in $O\big(|E| + \big(f_1(k)\big)^{2k}\big)$ time, where $f_1(k) = 2^{6k+1} + 180k^3$.*

As a proof of Theorem 1, we will prove that Algorithm 1, described below, is such an algorithm. In Section 3.1, we will explain the algorithm step by step, together with its correctness. We will show in Section 3.2 that our algorithm for planar graphs can be extended to that for $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs, $t \geq 3$.

3.1 Planar graphs

As we have mentioned in Introduction, our algorithm is based on two main ideas: it returns "YES" as soon as we can find a sufficiently large buffer space (Lemmas 1 and 3); otherwise it shrinks the graph so as to preserve the existence/nonexistence of a reconfiguration sequence between two given independent sets I_0 and I_r (Lemma 4). After shrinking the graph into a smaller one of the order depending only on k, we can solve the problem in a brute-force manner (Lemma 5). It is important to notice that our algorithm returns "NO" only in this brute-force step. In the following, we explain how the algorithm finds a buffer space or shrinks the graph, which well utilizes the $K_{3,3}$-forbiddance of G.

At the beginning part of the algorithm (lines 1–2), we set two parameters α and β as $4k$ and $10k$, respectively. These are the orders of (sub)graphs that guarantee the existence of sufficiently large independent sets that will be used as a buffer space. Let $A = N_G(I_0 \cup I_r) \setminus (I_0 \cup I_r)$, that is, the set of vertices that are not in $I_0 \cup I_r$ and have at least one neighbor in $I_0 \cup I_r$. Let $R = V \setminus N_G[I_0 \cup I_r]$. Then, no vertex in R is adjacent with any vertex in $I_0 \cup I_r$. Notice that $I_0 \cup I_r$, A and R form a partition of V.

Step 1: Lines 3–4 of Algorithm 1.

If $|R| \geq \alpha = 4k$, then by Proposition 1 the subgraph $G[R]$ has an independent set of size at least k. Then, the algorithm returns "YES" because we can use it as a buffer space, as follows.

Lemma 1. *If $|R| \geq \alpha$, there is a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r.*

Algorithm 1 TokenJump for planar graphs

Input: A parameter k, a planar graph $G = (V, E)$, and two independent sets I_0 and I_r of G such that $|I_0| = |I_r| = k$.

Output: "YES" if there is a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r; otherwise "NO."

1: $\alpha := 4k$, $\beta := 10k$.
2: $A := N_G(I_0 \cup I_r) \setminus (I_0 \cup I_r)$, $R := V \setminus N_G[I_0 \cup I_r]$.
3: **if** $|R| \geq \alpha$ **then** {Step 1: R has a sufficiently large buffer space}
4: **return** "YES" and exit.
5: **else** {$|R| < \alpha$ holds below}
6: **for** each vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V \setminus A}$ **do**
7: $A(\boldsymbol{x}) := \{v \in A \mid N_G(v) \cap (V \setminus A) = \mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})\}$.
8: **if** $|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \geq \beta$ **then**
9: **if** $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_0| \leq 1$ and $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_r| \leq 1$ **then**
10: {Step 2: $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ has a sufficiently large buffer space}
11: **return** "YES" and exit.
12: **else** {Step 3: shrink the graph}
13: Choose an arbitrary subset $B(\boldsymbol{x})$ of $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ with β vertices, and remove all vertices in $A(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{x})$ from V (and update V).
14: **end if**
15: **end if**
16: **end for**{$|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq \beta$ hold for all vectors $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V \setminus A}$}
17: **end if**{The order of G now depends only on k}
18: Check the existence of a reconfiguration sequence in a brute-force manner.

Proof. Let I' be an independent set of $G[R]$ with $|I'| \geq k$; by Proposition 1 such an independent set I' always exists. Since no vertex in $G[R]$ is adjacent with any vertex in $I_0 \cup I_r$, there is a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r via I', as follows: move all tokens on the vertices in I_0 to vertices in I' one by one; and move all tokens on vertices in I' to the vertices in I_r one by one. □

Step 2: Lines 9–11 of Algorithm 1.

We now know that $|R| < \alpha$. Since R was small, the algorithm then tries to find a sufficiently large buffer space in A. Notice that

$$|V \setminus A| = |I_0 \cup I_r \cup R| < 2k + \alpha, \tag{1}$$

which depends only on k. We will partition A into at most $2^{2k+\alpha} = 2^{6k}$ subsets, according to how the vertices in A are adjacent with vertices in $V \setminus A$.

Before partitioning A, we first introduce a new notation. For a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, let $\boldsymbol{x}$ be an $|S|$-dimensional binary vector in $\{0,1\}^S$; we denote by x_v the component of $\boldsymbol{x}$ corresponding to a vertex $v \in S$. For each vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^S$, let $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \{v \in S \mid x_v = 1\}$. For example, if $\boldsymbol{x} = (10011) \in \{0,1\}^{\{1,4,5,6,8\}}$ for a vertex set $S = \{1,4,5,6,8\}$, then $x_1 = 1$, $x_4 = 0$, $x_5 = 0$, $x_6 = 1$, $x_8 = 1$ and $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \{1,6,8\}$.



Fig. 2. Partitioning A of six large (blue) vertices into four subsets $A(100)$, $A(101)$, $A(011)$ and $A(001)$, where each vertex in $V \setminus A = \{1, 2, 3\}$ is represented by a small (white) circle.

To partition the vertex set A, we prepare all binary vectors in $\{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}$. By Eq. (1) the number of the prepared vectors is at most $2^{2k+\alpha} = 2^{6k}$. For each vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}$, we define $A(\boldsymbol{x}) = \{v \in A \mid N_G(v) \cap (V \setminus A) = \mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})\}$, that is, $\boldsymbol{x}$ is used to represent a pattern of neighbors in $V \setminus A$. (See Fig. 2.) Therefore, all vertices in the same subset $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ have exactly the same neighbors in $V\setminus A = I_0 \cup I_r \cup R$, that is, the vertices in $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$. Conversely, each vertex in $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is adjacent with *all* vertices in $A(\boldsymbol{x})$. We thus have the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *For each vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}$, $G[A(\boldsymbol{x}) \cup \mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})]$ contains a complete bipartite graph $K_{|A(\boldsymbol{x})|,|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})|}$ as a subgraph whose bipartition consists of $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$.*

Note that 0-vector (i.e., every component is 0) is not used, because each vertex in A is adjacent to at least one vertex in $I_0 \cup I_r$. In this way, we partition A into at most $2^{2k+\alpha}$ subsets $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ according to the vectors $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}$. Proposition 3 and the $K_{3,3}$-forbiddance give the following property on $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$. (Note that $\beta \geq 3$.)

Lemma 2. *If $|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \geq \beta$ holds for a vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}$, then $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq 2$.*

The algorithm tries to find a sufficiently large buffer space from one of the subsets $A(\boldsymbol{x})$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}$, such that $|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \geq \beta = 10k$. The following lemma proves the correctness of Step 2.

Lemma 3. *Suppose that there exists a binary vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}$ such that $|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \geq \beta$, $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_0| \leq 1$ and $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_r| \leq 1$. Then, there exists a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r.*

Proof. Suppose that such a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ exists. Since $|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \geq \beta = 10k$, by Proposition 1 the graph $G[A(\boldsymbol{x})]$ has an independent set I' of size at least $2k$. Let $w_0 \in \mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_0$ and $w_r \in \mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_r$ if such vertices exist; $w_0 = w_r$ may hold. Then, we obtain a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r via I', as follows:

(a) move the token on w_0 to an arbitrary vertex w' in I';
(b) move all tokens in $I_0 \setminus \{w_0\}$ to vertices in $I' \setminus \{w'\}$ one by one;
(c) move tokens in $I' \setminus \{w'\}$ to the vertices in $I_r \setminus \{w_r\}$ one by one; and
(d) move the last token on $w' \in I'$ to w_r.

Note that no vertex in $I_0 \setminus \{w_0\}$ is adjacent with any vertex in I' because $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_0| \leq 1$. Furthermore, since I' is an independent set in $G[A(\boldsymbol{x})]$, $w' \in I'$

is not adjacent with any vertex in $I' \setminus \{w'\}$. Therefore, we can execute both (a) and (b) above without violating the independence of tokens. By the symmetric arguments, we can execute both (c) and (d) above, too. Thus, according to (a)–(d) above, there exists a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r. □

Step 3: Line 13 of Algorithm 1.

We now consider to shrink the graph: the algorithm shrinks each subset $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ of size more than β into a smaller one $B(\boldsymbol{x})$ of size β.

Consider any subset $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ of size more than β. Then, by Lemma 2 we have $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq 2$. In fact, since we have executed Step 2, $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_0| = 2$ or $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_r| = 2$ holds (recall Lemma 3). We choose an arbitrary set $B(\boldsymbol{x})$ of $\beta = 10k$ vertices from $A(\boldsymbol{x})$. Then, localizing independent sets intersecting $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ only to $B(\boldsymbol{x})$ does not affect the reconfigurability, as in the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *G has a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r if and only if there exists a reconfiguration sequence $\langle I_0, I'_1, I'_2, \ldots, I'_{\ell'}, I_r \rangle$ such that $I'_j \cap A(\boldsymbol{x}) \subseteq B(\boldsymbol{x})$ holds for every index $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \ell'\}$.*

Proof. The if-part clearly holds, and hence we prove the only-if-part. Suppose that G has a reconfiguration sequence $\langle I_0, I_1, \ldots, I_\ell, I_r \rangle$ between I_0 and I_r. If $I_j \cap A(\boldsymbol{x}) \subseteq B(\boldsymbol{x})$ holds for every $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \ell\}$, the claim is already satisfied. Thus, let I_p and I_q be the first and last independent sets of G, respectively, in the subsequence $\langle I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_\ell \rangle$ such that $I_j \cap (A(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{x})) \neq \emptyset$. Note that $p = q$ may hold. Then, I_p contains exactly one vertex w_p in $I_p \cap (A(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{x}))$, and I_q contains exactly one vertex w_q in $I_q \cap (A(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{x}))$; $w_p = w_q$ may hold. It should be noted that both $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_p = \emptyset$ and $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_q = \emptyset$ hold, because $w_p, w_q \in A(\boldsymbol{x})$ are both adjacent with the two vertices in $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$.

We first claim that $G[B(\boldsymbol{x})]$ contains an independent set I^* such that $|I^*| \geq k$ and $I^* \cap N_G[I_p \cup I_q] = \emptyset$. By Proposition 3, $G[A(\boldsymbol{x}) \cup \mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})]$ contains a complete bipartite graph $K_{|A(\boldsymbol{x})|,2}$ as a subgraph; recall that $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})| = 2$. Therefore, due to the $K_{3,3}$-forbiddance of G, every vertex in $V \setminus \mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$ can be adjacent with at most two vertices in $A(\boldsymbol{x})$, and hence at most two vertices in $B(\boldsymbol{x})$. Since both $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_p = \emptyset$ and $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cap I_q = \emptyset$ hold, we have $I_p, I_q \subseteq V \setminus \mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and hence

$$\big|B(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus N_G[I_p \cup I_q]\big| \geq \beta - 3 \cdot |I_p \cup I_q| \geq 10k - 6k = 4k. \tag{2}$$

By Proposition 1 we conclude that $G[B(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus N_G[I_p \cup I_q]]$ contains an independent set I^* such that $|I^*| \geq k$ and $I^* \cap N_G[I_p \cup I_q] = \emptyset$.

We then show that the subsequence $\langle I_p, I_{p+1}, \ldots, I_q \rangle$ can be replaced with another sequence $\langle \tilde{I}_p, \tilde{I}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{I}_{q'} \rangle$ such that $\tilde{I}_j \cap A(\boldsymbol{x}) \subseteq B(\boldsymbol{x})$ for every $j \in \{p, p+1, \ldots, q'\}$. To do so, we use the independent set I^* of $G[B(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus N_G[I_p \cup I_q]]$ as a buffer space. We now explain how to move the tokens:

(1) From the independent set I_{p-1}, we first move the token on the vertex u_p in $I_{p-1} \setminus I_p$ to an arbitrarily chosen vertex v^* in I^*, instead of w_p. Let $\tilde{I}_p$ be the resulting vertex set, that is, $\tilde{I}_p = (I_p \setminus \{w_p\}) \cup \{v^*\}$.

(2) We then move all tokens in $I_{p-1} \setminus \{u_p\}$ $\big(= I_{p-1} \cap I_p\big)$ to vertices in $I^* \setminus \{v^*\}$ one by one in an arbitrary order.

(3) We move tokens in $I^* \setminus \{v^*\}$ to the vertices in $I_q \cap I_{q+1}$ $\big(= I_q \setminus \{w_q\}\big)$ one by one in an arbitrary order. Let $\tilde{I}_{q'}$ be the resulting vertex set, that is, $\tilde{I}_{q'} = (I_q \setminus \{w_q\}) \cup \{v^*\} = (I_q \cap I_{q+1}) \cup \{v^*\}$.

Clearly, $\tilde{I}_j \cap A(\boldsymbol{x}) \subseteq B(\boldsymbol{x})$ holds for every $j \in \{p, \ldots, q'\}$. Furthermore, notice that I_{q+1} can be obtained from $\tilde{I}_{q'}$ by moving a single token on $v^* \in \tilde{I}_{q'}$ to the vertex in $I_{q+1} \setminus I_q$. Therefore, $\langle I_p, I_{p+1}, \ldots, I_q \rangle$ can be correctly replaced with $\langle \tilde{I}_p, \tilde{I}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{I}_{q'} \rangle$ if the vertex set $\tilde{I}_j$ forms an independent set of G for every $j \in \{p, \ldots, q'\}$. For every $j \in \{p, \ldots, q'\}$, notice that either $\tilde{I}_j \subset I_p \cup I^*$ or $\tilde{I}_j \subset I_q \cup I^*$ holds. Then, since $I^* \cap N_G[I_p \cup I_q] = \emptyset$, the vertex set $\tilde{I}_j$ forms an independent set of G.

By this way, we obtain a reconfiguration sequence $\langle I_0, \ldots, I_{p-1}, \tilde{I}_p, \ldots, \tilde{I}_{q'}, I_{q+1}, \ldots, I_r \rangle$ such that no vertex in $A(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{x})$ is contained in any independent set in the sequence. □

Lemma 4 implies that, even if we remove all vertices in $A(\boldsymbol{x}) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{x})$ for an arbitrary chosen set $B(\boldsymbol{x}) \subseteq A(\boldsymbol{x})$ of $\beta = 10k$ vertices, it does not affect the existence/nonexistence of a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r. Thus, we can shrink the subset $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ into $B(\boldsymbol{x})$ of size $\beta = 10k$.

Step 4: Line 18 of Algorithm 1.

In this step, $|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq \beta = 10k$ hold for all vectors $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V \setminus A}$. Furthermore, Proposition 3 and the $K_{3,3}$-forbiddance of G imply that $|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq 2$ if $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})| \geq 3$. Since $\alpha = 4k$ and $\beta = 10k$, by Eq. (1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|A| &= \sum \{|A(\boldsymbol{x})| : \boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V \setminus A},\ 1 \leq |\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq 2\} \\
&\quad + \sum \{|A(\boldsymbol{x})| : \boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V \setminus A},\ |\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})| \geq 3\} \\
&\leq \beta \cdot \left((2k+\alpha) + \binom{2k+\alpha}{2} \right) + 2 \cdot \left(2^{2k+\alpha} - (2k+\alpha) - \binom{2k+\alpha}{2} \right) \\
&= 2^{6k+1} + 180k^3 - 6k^2 - 6k.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, since $|I_0 \cup I_r| \leq 2k$ and $|R| \leq \alpha = 4k$, we can bound $|V|$ by

$$|V| = |I_0 \cup I_r| + |R| + |A| < 2^{6k+1} + 180k^3,$$

which is denoted by $f_1(k)$. Since the order $f_1(k)$ of G now depends only on k, we can apply a brute-force algorithm as follows.

Lemma 5. *If $|V| \leq f_1(k)$,* TOKEN JUMPING *is solvable in $O\Big(\big(f_1(k)\big)^{2k}\Big)$ time.*

Proof. We construct a *configuration graph* $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, as follows:

(i) each node in $\mathcal{C}$ corresponds to an independent set of G with size k; and

(ii) two nodes in $\mathcal{C}$ are joined by an edge if and only if the corresponding two independent sets can be reconfigured by just a single token jump.

Clearly, there is a reconfiguration sequence between I_0 and I_r if and only if there is a path in $\mathcal{C}$ between the two corresponding nodes.

Since G has at most the number $\binom{f_1(k)}{k}$ of distinct independent sets of size exactly k, we have $|\mathcal{V}| \leq \big(f_1(k)\big)^k$. The configuration graph $\mathcal{C}$ above can be constructed in $O(|\mathcal{V}|^2)$ time. Furthermore, by the breadth-first search on $\mathcal{C}$ which starts from the node corresponding to I_0, we can check if $\mathcal{C}$ has a desired path or not in $O(|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|) = O(|\mathcal{V}|^2)$ time. In this way, TOKEN JUMPING can be solved in $O(|\mathcal{V}|^2) = O\big(\big(f_1(k)\big)^{2k}\big)$ time in total. □

This completes the correctness proof of Algorithm 1.

Running time.

We now estimate the running time of Algorithm 1. We first claim that lines 1–17 can be executed in $O(|E|)$ time. Lines 6–16 can be clearly done in fixed-parameter running time, but actually these lines can be done in $O(|E|)$ time because $|A| = |\bigcup\{A(\boldsymbol{x}) : \boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}\}|$ is at most n; we can compute $\boldsymbol{x}$ implicitly. By Lemma 5 we can execute line 18 in $O\big(\big(f_1(k)\big)^{2k}\big)$ time. Thus, the total running time of Algorithm 1 is $O\big(|E| + \big(f_1(k)\big)^{2k}\big)$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

3.2 $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs

In this subsection, we show that our algorithm for planar graphs can be extended to that for $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs, and give the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *For a fixed integer $t \geq 3$, let G be a $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graph. Then,* TOKEN JUMPING *for G can be solved in fixed-parameter running time, when parameterized by the number k of tokens.*

We here give a sketch of how to adapt the fixed-parameter algorithm for planar graphs in Section 3.1 to $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs.

The first point is to set two parameters α_t and β_t that correspond to α and β, respectively. Recall that $\alpha = 4k$ and $\beta = 10k$ are the orders of (sub)graphs that guarantee the existence of sufficiently large independent sets that will be used as a buffer space. For $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs, we set $\alpha_t = \mathsf{Ramsey}(k, t+3)$ and $\beta_t = \mathsf{Ramsey}((2t+1)k, t+3)$. Then, Proposition 2 guarantees the existence of independent sets of size k in R, and hence Step 1 of Algorithm 1 can be adapted to $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs. We note that, although no exact formula of Ramsey number is known, we can bound it from above, say $\mathsf{Ramsey}(a,b) \leq \binom{a+b-2}{b-1}$ [7]. Therefore, we indeed set $\alpha_t = (k+t+1)^{t+2}$ and $\beta_t = \big((2t+1)k + t + 1\big)^{t+2}$, both of which are fixed-parameter size.

The second point is to extend Lemma 2 for planar graphs to that for $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs, as follows. (Note that $\beta_t \geq t$.)

Lemma 6. *If $|A(\boldsymbol{x})| \geq \beta_t$ holds for a vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{V\setminus A}$, then $|\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq 2$.*

Then, since there is an independent set of size at least $(2t+1)k$ in $A(\boldsymbol{x})$, Step 2 of Algorithm 1 can be adapted to $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs.

The third point is to modify Eq. (2) in the proof of Lemma 4 and shrink $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ to size β_t. Recall that the vertices in $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ form a complete bipartite graph $K_{2,|A(\boldsymbol{x})|}$, and hence any vertex other than $\mathsf{ON}(\boldsymbol{x})$ can be adjacent with at most $(t-1)$ vertices in $A(\boldsymbol{x})$, due to the $K_{3,t}$-forbiddance of the graph. Therefore, if $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ has an independent set of size at least $(2t+1)k$, we still have at least k vertices that can be used as a buffer space. Therefore, Lemma 4 can be adapted to $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graphs, and hence Step 3 of Algorithm 1 can be, too.

The running time of the adapted algorithm depends on the order of the graph shrunk by Step 3. By the similar arguments for planar graphs, the order of the shrunk graph depends only on α_t and β_t. Since both α_t and β_t are fixed-parameter size, the adapted algorithm runs in fixed-parameter running time.

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

4 Shortest Reconfiguration Sequence

In the previous section, we present an algorithm which simply determines if there exists a reconfiguration sequence between two given independent sets I_0 and I_r. If the answer is yes, it is natural to consider how we actually move tokens on I_0 to I_r. For this question, it is easy to modify Algorithm 1 to output an actual reconfiguration sequence, although it is not always shortest. In this section, we consider how to move tokens on I_0 to I_r in a shortest way.

Theorem 3. *For a fixed integer $t \geq 3$, let G be a $K_{3,t}$-forbidden graph. Given a yes-instance of* TOKEN JUMPING *on G, a shortest reconfiguration sequence can be found in fixed-parameter running time, where the parameter is the number k of tokens.*

Proof sketch. We explain how to modify Algorithm 1 so as to find a shortest reconfiguration sequence. The biggest change from Algorithm 1 is that the modified algorithm does not stop until Step 4. Algorithm 1 can exit at Steps 1 and 2 after finding a buffer space, which means that there exists a reconfiguration sequence from I_0 to I_r via vertices only in R and vertices only in $A(\boldsymbol{x})$, respectively. However, this does not directly imply the existence of a *shortest* reconfiguration sequence from I_0 to I_r that uses vertices only in R (or only in $A(\boldsymbol{x})$). Thus, we do not exit at Steps 1 and 2, but shrink R and $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ of the original graph into a fixed-parameter size so as to preserve the shortest length of a reconfiguration sequence in the original graph; then we can find a shortest reconfiguration sequence in Step 4 by the brute-force algorithm proposed in Lemma 5. (Details are omitted from this extended abstract.) □

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Akira Suzuki, Ryuhei Uehara, and Katsuhisa Yamanaka for fruitful discussions with them. We thank anonymous referees for their helpful

suggestions. This work is partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI 25106504 and 25330003 (T. Ito), and 25104521 and 26540005 (H. Ono), and by the (Polish) National Science Center under grant no. 2013/09/B/ST6/03136 (M. Kamiński).

References

1. Bonamy, M., Johnson, M., Lignos, I., Patel, V., Paulusma, D.: Reconfiguration graphs for vertex colourings of chordal and chordal bipartite graphs. J. Combinatorial Optimization 27, pp. 132–143 (2014)
2. Bonsma, P.: Independent set reconfiguration in cographs. To appear in WG 2014. `arXiv:1402.1587` (2014)
3. Bonsma, P., Cereceda, L.: Finding paths between graph colourings: PSPACE-completeness and superpolynomial distances. Theoretical Computer Science 410, pp. 5215–5226 (2009)
4. Bonsma, P., Kamiński, M., Wrochna, M.: Reconfiguring independent sets in claw-free graphs. Proc. of SWAT 2014, LNCS 8503, pp. 86–97 (2014)
5. Brandstädt, A., Le, V.B., Spinrad, J.P.: Graph Classes: A Survey, SIAM (1999)
6. Gopalan, P., Kolaitis, P.G., Maneva, E.N., Papadimitriou, C.H.: The connectivity of Boolean satisfiability: Computational and structural dichotomies. SIAM J. Computing 38, pp. 2330–2355 (2009)
7. Graham, R.L., Rothschild, B.L.: Ramsey Theory (2nd Ed.). Wiley-Interscience, New York, NY, USA (1990)
8. Hearn, R.A., Demaine, E.D.: PSPACE-completeness of sliding-block puzzles and other problems through the nondeterministic constraint logic model of computation. Theoretical Computer Science 343, pp. 72–96 (2005)
9. Ito, T., Demaine, E.D., Harvey, N.J.A., Papadimitriou, C.H., Sideri, M., Uehara, R., Uno, Y.: On the complexity of reconfiguration problems. Theoretical Computer Science 412, pp. 1054–1065 (2011)
10. Ito, T., Kamiński, M., Demaine, E.D.: Reconfiguration of list edge-colorings in a graph. Discrete Applied Mathematics 160, pp. 2199–2207 (2012)
11. Ito, T., Kamiński, M., Ono, H., Suzuki, A., Uehara, R., Yamanaka, K.: On the parameterized complexity for token jumping on graphs. Proc. of TAMC 2014, LNCS 8402, pp. 341–351 (2014)
12. Ito, T., Kawamura, K., Ono, H., Zhou, X.: Reconfiguration of list $L(2,1)$-labelings in a graph. Theoretical Computer Science 544, pp. 84–97 (2014)
13. Kamiński, M., Medvedev, P., Milanič, M.: Complexity of independent set reconfigurability problems. Theoretical Computer Science 439, pp. 9–15 (2012)
14. Mouawad, A.E., Nishimura, N., Raman, V., Simjour, N., Suzuki, A.: On the parameterized complexity of reconfiguration problems. Proc. of IPEC 2013, LNCS 8246, pp. 281–294 (2013)
15. Mouawad, A.E., Nishimura, N., Raman, V., Wrochna, M.: Reconfiguration over tree decompositions. `arXiv:1405.2447`
16. Wrochna, M.: Reconfiguration in bounded bandwidth and treedepth. `arXiv:1405.0847` (2014)

17. Robertson, N., Sanders, D.P., Seymour, P., Thomas, R.: Efficiently four-coloring planar graphs. Proc. of STOC 1996, pp. 571–575 (1996)